

Docket No. CITI0035-CON

#24
11-13-02
PATENT mel

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the U.S. Application of

Michael GRANDCOLAS, et al.

Group Art Unit: 2161

U.S. Serial No.: 09/240,588

Examiner: Elisca, P.

Filed: February 01, 1999

For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR AUTOMATICALLY HARMONIZING ACCESS
TO A SOFTWARE APPLICATION PROGRAM VIA DIFFERENT ACCESS
DEVICES

APPEAL BRIEF

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED
OCT 25 2002
GROUP 3500

Sir:

This is an Appeal Brief under 37 C.F.R. § 1.192 in connection with the decisions of the Examiner in an Advisory Action mailed on March 20, 2002. Each of the topics required by Rule 192 is presented herewith and is labeled appropriately.

(1) **Real Party In Interest**

The real party in interest is Citicorp Development Center, Inc. (formerly Transaction Technology, Inc.)

(2) **Related Appeals And Interferences**

There are no other appeals or interferences related to this case.

(3) **Status Of Claims**

Claims 14-27 are pending and rejected. Claims 14-27 are hereby appealed.

10/23/2002 AWONDAF1 00000082 09240588

01 FC:1402

320.00 OP

(4) Status of Amendments

There are no outstanding amendments.

(5) Summary Of The Invention

The present invention is directed to a system and method for automatically harmonizing access to a given software application program via different access devices. Through use of the method and system, a financial institution can provide access to a desired application (such as, for example, automatic bill payment services) to customers using different access devices such as web browsers, screen phones and personal computers. A single application program is all that needs to be written and maintained by the financial institution. Page 3, lines 11-17.

The invention achieves the aforementioned objectives by receiving information from the user via the user's access device, including information identifying the type of device being used and the application program the user wishes to access. The application program is then accessed and the information to be displayed to the user is identified. This information is automatically translated into a format which is compatible with the device, including its display, and sent to the device for display. Page 3, lines 22-28.

In order to be processed by a token-creator-mapper into a desired format for the user's device, the application stream of the desired application needs to contain tokens. A token or tag is a single element of an encoding language. As used by the present invention, a token is an element of the electronic communication language used between the financial institution's application software and the token-creator-mapper. Therefore, by adding a token representation to an application stream en route to a customer, one is ensured that the application stream will be in a form comprehensible by the customer's computer system. Page 5, lines 10-19.

When an application stream contains data without any tokens, the stream may be directed to a parser, which then adds a token representation or tokenizes the application

stream. The tokenized application stream is then directed to the token-creator-mapper, which maps the application stream into a token representation that is understood by the user's device. Page 5, line 20 – Page 6, line 12.

(6) Issue

Whether the Examiner's rejection of claims 14-27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nguyen et al. (U.S.P. No. 6,072,870) is proper.

(7) Grouping of Claims

Claims 14-27 are arranged into 3 groups, wherein the claim(s) in each group stand or fall together for purposes of this appeal.

GROUP	CLAIMS
(1)	14-18, 22, 23, 26, and 27
(2)	19-21
(3)	24, 25

(8) Argument

**The Rejection of Claims 14-27 Under 35. U.S.C. § 102(e) As Being Anticipated by
Nguyen et al. is Not Proper**

Despite a Response to Final Office Action differentiating Nguyen et al. from the claimed invention, as filed on February 19, 2002, the Examiner maintained the rejection of pending claims 14-27 in the Advisory Action, stating in general that,

“Applicant argues that Nguyen et al. does not teach ‘a random capture token to associate the payment capture request...’. As specified by the Examiner in the [Final] Office Action mailed on 11/19/2001, page 4, lines 1-5, this limitation is disclosed by Nguyen.”

Once again, this rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons:

With regard to claims 14-18, 22, 23, 26, and 27, the Examiner asserted that the claimed limitation of “creating a token representative of the data stream from the desired application” is disclosed by Nguyen et al. in col. 18, lines 48-67, specifically,

“wherein it is stated payment gateway computer system generates a **random** capture token. ***Random capture token is utilized in subsequent payment capture processing to associate the payment capture request with the payment authorization request being processed***, please note that the process of utilizing or generating token by the computer system in subsequent payment capture is readable as the process of creating a token representation of the data.” (Emphasis added). See Final Office Action of 11/19/01, p. 4.

As admitted by the PTO in the aforementioned paragraph, Nguyen et al. actually teach away from the claimed invention because their payment gate computer system merely generates a **random** capture token ***to associate the payment capture request with the payment authorization request***. Thus, the process of utilizing or generating a token by the computer system of Nguyen et al. in subsequent payment capture is ***not readable*** nor ***can it be interpreted*** as the process of “creating a token representation of a data stream of the desired application” as claimed. In other words, the capture token generated by the system of Nguyen et al. is merely a **random** token associating a payment capture request to a payment authorization request, and it is not used as a token representation of the data stream parsed from the desired application (i.e., the payment capture request or the payment authorization request, if they can even be considered as applications) as claimed.

Claims 14-18, 22, 23, 26, and 27 stand or fall together with regard to the rejection under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Nguyen et al. for purposes of this appeal. For the reasons stated above, it is respectfully requested that the Board recognize the deficiencies in the Examiner’s rejection of the claims, reverse the Examiner’s rejection, and allow claims 14-18.

With regard to claims 19-21, they are allowable over Nguyen et al. and other references of record for the same reasons set forth above with regard to claims 14-18. Furthermore, Nguyen et al. fail to disclose the features of claims 19-21, namely, “a token-creator-mapper for creating ***a first token representation*** and ***a second token representation***

of the data provided by the application that are respectively received by the first access device and the second access device.” (Emphasis added).

Claims 19-21 stand or fall together with regard to the rejection under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Nguyen et al. for purposes of this appeal. For the reasons stated above, it is respectfully requested that the Board recognize the deficiencies in the Examiner’s rejection of the claims, reverse the Examiner’s rejection, and allow claims 19-21.

With regard to claims 24-25, they are allowable over Nguyen et al. and other references of record for the same reasons set forth above with regard to claims 14-21. Furthermore, the process of authorizing credit in the system of Nguyen et al. *is not readable* nor *can it be interpreted* as the process of identifying the data stream as a legacy application stream, as asserted by the Examiner. See Final Office Action of 11/19/01, p. 3. This is because the *random* token representation in col. 18, lines 48-65, cited by the Examiner is not a created token representation of the authorizing credit data stream of Nguyen et al., i.e., the legacy application stream as stated in claim 24.

Claims 24-25 stand or fall together with regard to the rejection under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Nguyen et al. for purposes of this appeal. For the reasons stated above, it is respectfully requested that the Board recognize the deficiencies in the Examiner’s rejection of the claims, reverse the Examiner’s rejection, and allow claims 24-25.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons given above, the rejection of claims 14-27 is improper. It is respectfully requested that such rejections by the Examiner be reversed and claims 14-27 be allowed. Attached below for the Board’s convenience is an Appendix of claims 14-27 as currently pending.


U.S. Serial No.: 09/240,588

-6-

Docket No. CITI0035-CON

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/21/02
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
Suite 900
607 14th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 508-5800
GTM/THN/T0091.094251/130441

By: 
George T. Marcou
Registration No. 33,014

(9) Appendix

14. A method of interfacing a plurality of different access devices to either a legacy application or a canonical application comprising;

 parsing a data stream from the desired application if the desired application is a legacy application;

 creating a token representation of the data stream from the desired application, regardless if the application is a legacy application or a canonical application; and

 forwarding the token representation to one of the plurality of access devices.

15. The method of claim 14 further comprising:

 displaying the data stream on the one access device.

16. The method of claim 14 wherein the one access device is a home computer.

17. The method of claim 14 wherein the one access device is a personal digital assistant.

18. The method of claim 14 wherein the one access device is a screenphone.

19. A system for distributing information to a plurality of customers comprising:
 an application for providing data in response to a request for data;

 a token creator-mapper for creating a first token representation of the data provided by the application and a second token representation of the data provided by the application;
 and

 a plurality of different access devices for each of the plurality of customers wherein a first access device receives the first token representation of the data and the second access device receives the second token representation.

20. The system of claim 19 wherein the first token representation and the second token representation of data include data specific to one customer.

21. The system of claim 19 wherein the first token representation and the second token representation of data include data generic to the plurality of customers.

22. A method of interfacing an access device with a software application, comprising:

- producing a data stream from the software application;
- providing a token representation of the data stream from the software application; and
- forwarding the token representation to the access device.

23. The method of claim 22, wherein providing the token representation of the data stream from the software application comprises:

- identifying the software application as one of a legacy application and a canonical application.

24. The method of claim 23, wherein providing the token representation of the data stream from the software application further comprises:

- if the software application is identified as a legacy application, identifying the data stream as a legacy application stream;
- determining that no token representation exists for the legacy application stream; and
- creating the token representation of the legacy application stream.

25. The method of claim 24, wherein forwarding the token representation to the access device comprises:

- mapping the token representation to a token stream that is particular to a renderer of the access device.

26. The method of claim 23, wherein providing the token representation of the data stream from the software application further comprises:

if the software application is identified as a canonical application, identifying the data stream as a canonical application stream having the token representation of the canonical application stream.

27. The method of claim 22, wherein forwarding the token representation to the access device comprises:

mapping the token representation to a token stream that is particular to a renderer of the access device.